

## REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2006, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by March 1, 2007.

Claims 1, 7, and 9-10 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the election requirement was made final and claims 11-17 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,492,231 to Mandl.

In the present amendment, claim 1 was amended to more clearly define the present invention over the cited reference to Mandl by adding the features of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8, all of which have been canceled. The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as defined in amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Mandl.

Mandl does not disclose that the clamping bodies are arrestable by an integrated clamping lever which would make the clamping structure simple and reliable. Rather, Mandl's device requires a screw driver for moving the clamping bodies into their clamping position, after which different means must be moved to maintain the clamping effect. Thus, the clamping bodies themselves are not arrested in the maximum clamping position and as such, do not provide a reliable, secure clamping effect.

The Applicant furthermore respectfully submits that Mandl is not a proper reference under 35 USC 102 pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the last

paragraph of **MPEP section 2131**, where it is stated that “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”, and that “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim”. Because claim 1 includes features not disclosed by Mandl, claim 1, along with its dependent claims 7 and 9-10, is allowable over this reference. Withdrawal of the rejection under Section 102, therefore, is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing amendments and arguments in support of patentability, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**/ Michael J. Striker /**

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700